

### REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-18, 20, and 22-38 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 5, 10-12, 15, 22-25, and 33 have been amended and claims 9, 19, and 21 have been canceled.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 15, 25, and 33 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) for being anticipated by the Rashid publication. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

The Rashid publication discloses synchronizing a client and server by restoring both to a previous state of operation. (See Paragraph [0076]). However, Rashid does not disclose the features added by amendment to claim 1, including performing a recovery operation when the client and server have different context information, the recovery operation including

(a) “transmitting context information managed by the server to the client when the error occurs in the client, to achieve synchronization between the client and server as a result of the client and server having same context information,”

(b) “transmitting context information managed by the client to the server when the error occurs in the server, the achieve synchronization between the server and client as a result of the server and client having same context information,” and

(c) “wherein transmitting the context information to the client or server occurs without performing a power down operation or returning to an initialization state.”

Serial No. 10/780,866  
Amdt. dated May 21, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2007

Docket No. P-0630

Absent a teaching or suggestion of these features, it is respectfully submitted that the Rashid publication does not anticipate claim 1.

Claim 15 recites similar features for synchronizing a mobile station and network.

Claim 25 recites “transmitting information managed by a server to the client to resynchronize the client with the server as a result of the client and server having same information, wherein the client is resynchronized to the server based on said same information without performing a power down operation or returning to an initialization state.” The Rashid publication does not disclose these features. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 25 is allowable over Rashid.

Claim 33 recites “transmitting information managed by a client to the server to resynchronize the sever with the client as a result of the server and client having same information, wherein the server is resynchronized to the client based on said same information without performing a power down operation or returning to an initialization state.” The Rashid publication does not disclose these features. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 33 is allowable over Rashid.

Claims 1-3 and 5-38 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) for being anticipated by the Lupien patent. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

The Lupien patent discloses a method for performing a PDP context activation procedure when a mobile station enters a new routing area. Once context activation is performed, signaling messages are transmitted between the mobile station and network when an incoming voice call is received. (See column 30, lines 8-37). As shown in Figure 10, this message includes a paging request message including IMSI. The mobile station validates this message and then transmits an authentication request to perform a registration operation for an HLR or a VLR. The call is subsequently connected. (See Column 30, line 38 - Column 31, line 53).

The Lupien patent, therefore, is concerned with procedures for registering a mobile station when the mobile station moves into a new routing area, and then subsequently connecting a call. These operations involve transmitting a paging request signal for authentication and registration purposes. But, Lupien does not disclose performing a context synchronization method that involves:

(a) “transmitting context information managed by the server to the client when the error occurs in the client, to achieve synchronization between the client and server as a result of the client and server having same context information,”

(b) “transmitting context information managed by the client to the server when the error occurs in the server, the achieve synchronization between the server and client as a result of the server and client having same context information,” and

(c) “wherein transmitting the context information to the client or server occurs without performing a power down operation or returning to an initialization state.”

Absent a disclosure of these features, it is respectfully submitted that the Lupien patent does not anticipate the method defined in amended claim 1 or any of its dependent claims.

Claim 10 recites that if the failure occurs in the network of claim 1, then the “network receives the context information of the MS by sending a packet paging with an international mobility subscriber identity (IMSI) to the MS so that the received context information of the MS is used as context information of the network.” The Lupien patent does not disclose these features.

Claim 11 recites that “the context information of the MS received by the network includes INFO-type context information.” The specification provides a special definition for this type of context information at Paragraph [31]: “INFO-type CONTEXT means CONTEXT that transmits information of the transmission side without requesting a corresponding response.” The Lupien patent does not disclose these features. Moreover, the paging request signal cannot qualify as this information since the mobile station transmits a response to the paging request signal - see reference numeral 171 labeled “Page Response” in Figure 10.

Claim 12 recites that “if the failure occurs in the MS, the MS performs a query procedure and transfers INFO-type context information to the network.” The Lupien patent does not disclose these features.

Claim 13 that “in the query procedure, the MS transfers a query type context information to the network and receives a response from the network.” The Lupien patent does not disclose these features.

Claim 15 recites performing a recovery procedure if a failure occurs, wherein performing said recovery procedure includes:

(a) “transmitting context information managed by the mobile station to the network when the failure occurs in the network, to achieve synchronization between the mobile station and network as a result of the mobile station and network having same context information,”

(b) “transmitting context information managed by the network to the mobile station when the failure occurs in the mobile station, to achieve synchronization between the network and mobile station as a result of the network and mobile station having same context information,”

(c) “wherein transmitting the context information to the network or mobile station occurs without performing a power down operation or returning to an initialization state.” The Lupien patent does not disclose these features and therefore does not anticipate claim 15 or any of its dependent claims.

Claims 25 and 33 recite many of the same features that are not disclosed by the Lupien patent. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claims and their dependent claims are allowable.


Serial No. 10/780,866  
Amdt. dated May 21, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2007

Docket No. P-0630

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Daniel Y.J. Kim', written over the typed name.

Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.  
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros, Esq.  
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 766-3701 DYK/SWN:knh:kzw  
**Date: May 21, 2007**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**

\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-738\117145.doc